

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

By this amendment, the specification has been amended to insert “Cross-Reference to Related Applications” which contains information reflected on the filing receipt. Moreover, the specification has been amended so as to correct minor typographical errors as noted by the Examiner in paragraph 5 on page 3 of the Office action. It is submitted that no new matter has been added.

Further by this amendment, claims 6-7 and 12-15 have been cancelled, claims 1-5, 9-11 and 16-17 have been amended and claims 18-19 have been newly added. It is submitted no new matter has been added and support for the amended and newly added claims can be found, for example, at least by Figures 19-24 and 29 and the corresponding description of such figures contained in the specification.

The Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by Primary Examiner Huy Nguyen for conducting a personal interview with the Applicants’ representative on January 8, 2010 at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Included next is a Statement of the Substance of the Interview.

In paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Office action, the Examiner has noted that there have been conflicting inventor names and titles of the invention. Such mistake was caused due to a USPTO input error and requests for correcting this mistake were previously submitted via the paper request submitted August 15, 2008 and via PAIR request submitted November 2, 2009. Accordingly, correction of this USPTO error is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for the reasons contained in paragraph 3 of the office action. Particularly, the Examiner has mentioned that such claims fails to specify that the information is recorded on a non-transitory computer-readable medium. Accordingly, it is noted that claims 6-7 have been cancelled and claims 1-5 and 16 have been amended to recite a non-transitory computer-readable medium. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1-5 and 16 are clearly in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for the reasons contained in paragraph 5 of the Office action. It is submitted that this rejection has been rendered moot since claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled.

Independent claims 1, 8, 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamaguchi et al. (USPN:, 6,088,507), hereinafter Yamaguchi, for the reasons contained in paragraph 7 of the Office action and independent claims 1, 8, 16 and 17 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fukushima et al. (USPN: 5,596,564), hereinafter Fukushima, for the reasons contained in paragraph 8 of the Office action.

Without intending to acquiesce to the aforementioned prior art rejection and in order to expedite allowance of this application, independent claim 1 has been amended in order to more clearly distinguish such claim over the prior art relied upon by the Examiner.

Particularly, newly amended independent claim 1 recites playlist information defining a playback section of each of a plurality of digital streams, and including main-path information and sub-path information, the main-path information designates one of the digital streams as a main stream, and defines a portion of the main stream as a primary playback section, and the sub-path information designates another one of the digital streams as a substream, and defines a portion of the substream as a secondary playback section that is to be synchronously played back

with the primary playback section, wherein the sub-path information includes synchronous information and such synchronous information includes timing information indicating, on a timeline of the primary playback section, a synchronization point for the synchronous playback of the secondary playback section with the primary playback section.

Figure 19 of the present application depicts an example illustrating the main-path information and Figure 23 depicts an example illustrating the sub-path information. As shown in Figures 23 and 24 and as described in paragraph [0086] of the specification of the present application, the synchronous information of the sub-path information includes timing information indicating, on a timeline of the primary playback section, a synchronization point for the synchronous playback of the secondary playback section with the primary playback section [e.g., “synch\_start\_PTS\_of\_PlayItem specifies a point corresponding, on the playback timeline of the PlayItem specified by the synch\_PlayItem\_id, to the start point of the SubPlayItem specified by the SubPlayItem\_In\_time.”].

It is submitted that the aforementioned features as clearly recited in independent claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art cited by the Examiner. Particularly, it is submitted that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest the aforementioned sub-path information, including the synchronous information, which designates a substream that is different from a main stream.

Regarding the Yamaguchi reference, this reference discloses a piece of moving picture data and a plurality of pieces of sub-data are interleaved in each of the plurality of pieces of video data, wherein the plurality of pieces of sub-data are reproduced selectively and synchronized with the pieces of moving picture data [see column 2 (lines 30-34)]. Accordingly, the Yamaguchi reference fails to disclose or suggest sub-path information which designates a

substream that is different from a main stream and that such sub-path information includes synchronous information including timing information indicating, on a timeline of the primary playback section, a synchronization point for the synchronous playback of the secondary playback section with the primary playback section, as recited in independent claim 1.

Regarding the Fukushima reference, this reference discloses that each of the GOP (group of pictures) data 260 includes a compressed video data and a synchronized audio data with the video data [see column 10 (lines 60-62)]. Thus, the Fukushima reference similar to the Yamaguchi reference fails to disclose or suggest sub-path information which designates a substream that is different from a main stream and that such sub-path information includes synchronous information including timing information indicating, on a timeline of the primary playback section, a synchronization point for the synchronous playback of the secondary playback section with the primary playback section, as recited in independent claim 1.

Independent claims 8, 16, 17 and 19, while not identical to independent claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claims 8, 16, 17 and 19 are likewise allowable over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that each of independent claims 1, 8, 16, 17 and 19, as well as claims 2-5, 9-11 and 18 dependent therefrom, is clearly allowable and the Examiner is kindly requested to promptly pass this case to issuance.

In the event, however, that the Examiner has any comments or suggestion of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the Applicant's representatives to expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dhiren Odedra, Reg. #41,227/

Dhiren Odedra  
Reg. No. 41,227

January 13, 2010

Panasonic Patent Center  
1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Phone: 202-912-3800  
Fax: 202-912-0774

Customer No. 42212